



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fact concerning Douglas's early life which are manifestly incorrect. Touching upon the sources of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the author remarks that "contemporary newspaper matter is of comparatively little service during the period of the debates". He would surely have modified this statement, if he had consulted the latest and best edition of the debates (the Sparks edition).

There are many matters of interpretation in the book to which exception might be taken. Some of these are demonstrably unfair to Douglas; others are mere matter of opinion which cannot be discussed within the limits of this review. There are, however, certain errors which may not be passed over without comment. Some of these are of an anachronistic sort. Seward, Chase, and Sumner are described as "busy during the early fifties in organizing their great party" (p. 129). "Douglas understood by the end of November [1854] that the Kansas-Nebraska Act had created a tumult. . . ." (p. 225). Yet he had been burned in effigy and nearly mobbed in Chicago three months before. His position in the summer of 1856 is said to have been "rendered even more difficult" by the Dred Scott Decision (p. 237). Perhaps it is this anachronism which has led the author to state, without any evidence, that "the decision was a sorry blow" to him (p. 237).

More serious than these lapses, however, are some misapprehensions regarding matters of political history. It is stated that the Nebraska Bill "almost immediately became highly popular with the Southern element" (p. 193). The hesitation of many Southern leaders, on the contrary, is commented upon by newspaper correspondents. President Pierce endorsed "not only the Douglas bill but also the Dixon amendment" (p. 197). This Douglas bill, however, was the Kansas-Nebraska Bill which did not contain the Dixon amendment. By an odd slip, the author states that "the slave interest was stronger in the proposed territory of Nebraska than in Kansas" (p. 198). The first governor of Kansas was not Edwin but Andrew H. Reeder. The text does not make clear just what the people of Kansas voted upon in the summer of 1857—the Lecompton Constitution, the English bill, or the land ordinances (p. 254).

In general, this life of Douglas compares favorably with other volumes in the series, and it will doubtless call attention again to a much neglected figure in American politics.

ALLEN JOHNSON.

William H. Seward. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE, JR. [American Crisis Biographies.] (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs and Company. 1910. Pp. 388.)

CONSIDERING style as the mere vehicle of expression, Professor Hale's *Seward* has the superior qualities of clearness and fluency; and his temper is excellent. As to method, he himself says that it is "somewhat irregular": he might have said more without risk of contradic-

tion. Some omissions and superficialities seriously increase the irregularities. Mastery of many vast fields of facts must precede analysis, and analysis must precede a correct exposition of the tangled threads of politics and statesmanship. And we find only slight evidences of that insight into politics and human character, which is a prerequisite of success with a hero like Seward.

For just twenty years Seward was continuously either United States Senator or Secretary of State. During all but the last four years he was among the few most important men of that period; and whose national career has been so persistently disputed about in regard to so many subjects? Although his public life in his state, where he was senator from Cayuga County and governor, each for four years—was comparatively unimportant, just one-half of the volume is given to it. Our author admits that he has not examined the Seward papers in Auburn. If he had, perhaps he would not put so much stress on the two fragments of Seward's correspondence, heretofore unused, but which do not seem to have disclosed anything of real value. The first half of the book would be improved if the 180 pages were reduced to 90 or 100. Then the author might have found time for more than superficial and misleading accounts of Seward's schemes and acts during the winter of 1860-1861 and the following spring. He ought at least to have given clear and correct summaries of the investigations of previous writers on Seward. The climax of irregularity is to be found in the fact that Seward's four years in Johnson's Cabinet are considered worth hardly a dozen pages.

There are some remarkable blunders. We are told: "There was no one living who had preceded him [Seward] as the champion of anti-slavery in public life" (p. 260). The author ought at least to have heard of his namesake, John P. Hale, who, as representative from New Hampshire, defied his state's instructions to vote for the annexation of Texas and, in January, 1845, wrote a letter against it; was consequently defeated for renomination; was in 1846 elected United States senator; and in 1847 was nominated for the presidency by the National Liberty Convention, but declined. In the campaign of 1848 Seward supported General Taylor, a slaveholder; and did not enter the United States Senate until March, 1849, where Hale had been active and daring for two years. What was David Wilmot if not a national antislavery man after he introduced his proviso, in 1846? And there were others.

Professor Hale quotes (pp. 292-293) from the *Life and Correspondence of J. T. Delane* (published in 1908) a long sentence from a letter from Palmerston to Delane, the editor of the London *Times*, about the interview with Adams, in which he says that the British law officers had been consulted and had given the decision that the British practice would allow the seizure of the *Trent*. Professor Hale considers this a discovery deserving special comment. It is really as startling as finding one's pocket-knife in one's own pocket. Whoever will turn to the *Life of Charles Francis Adams* (published in 1900), p. 221—in the same para-

graph from which Professor Hale (*Seward*, p. 291) has just quoted—will see Adams's full and almost verbatim statement of all the important points mentioned by Palmerston! An intelligent reading of the chapters on the *Trent* in Adams's *Adams* and in Bancroft's *Seward* should have made it easy to write a concise, accurate, and impartial account of that great incident.

Professor Hale's bibliography leaves unnoticed, or mentions in the vaguest manner, most of the books about *Seward* that ought to be particularly described, to aid ordinary readers. Nicolay and Hay, Rhodes, and others of equal quality are not considered worth mentioning. But newspapers of Cayuga County and of Albany, the *New York Tribune*, and the *London Times*, are paraded as if they were rich and previously untouched mines, now thoroughly used and giving much prestige; and the last, we are gravely told, "should always be consulted for any special incident, as that of the *Trent* or Gladstone's Newcastle speech" (376)!

Reminiscences of the Geneva Tribunal of Arbitration, 1872. The Alabama Claims. By FRANK WARREN HACKETT. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1911. Pp. xvi, 450.)

MR. HACKETT's volume, besides embodying his personal recollections of the Geneva Tribunal, gives a full and careful exposition of the international controversy which that tribunal was organized finally to determine. The arbitration at Geneva related to the claims which the government of the United States preferred against that of Great Britain for compensation for the losses caused by the depredations of the *Alabama* and other Confederate cruisers fitted out in British ports during the Civil War. The United States asserted that Great Britain had incurred a liability to pay these claims, while Great Britain denied it; and in this assertion and denial there were involved disputed questions of law as to the scope of a neutral's duties and disputed questions of fact as to the manner in which the British authorities had performed their obligations. By the Treaty of Washington of May 8, 1871, three rules were agreed upon as a definition of neutral duty, and for the application of these rules provision was made for the appointment of a board of arbitrators. This board, which met at Geneva, consisted of Charles Francis Adams, appointed by the United States; Sir Alexander Cockburn, Lord Chief Justice of England, appointed by Great Britain; and Count Sclopis, Mr. Staempfli, and Baron d'Itajubá, respectively appointed by the governments of Italy, Switzerland, and Brazil. Before this tribunal Bancroft Davis and Lord Tenterden respectively represented, as agents, the United States and Great Britain. Caleb Cushing, William M. Evarts, and Morrison R. Waite, afterwards Chief Justice, appeared as counsel for the United States; Sir Roundell Palmer, afterwards Lord Selborne, alone had the title of counsel for Great Britain, but was assisted by Messrs. Mountague Bernard and Arthur Cohen.

Mr. Hackett, who had then lately been admitted to the bar, was